arXiv:1409.5950v1 [math.RA] 21 Sep 2014

Generalized derivations as a generalization of Jordan homomorphisms acting on Lie ideals and right ideals

Basudeb Dhara, Shervin Sahebi and Venus Rahmani

Abstract: Let R be a prime ring with center $Z(R)$ and extended centroid C, H a non-zero generalized derivation of R and $n \geq 1$ a fixed integer. In this paper we study the situations: (1) $H(u^2)^n - H(u)^{2n} \in C$ for all $u \in L$, where L is a non-central Lie ideal of R; (2) $H(u^2)^n - H(u)^{2n} = 0$ for all $u \in [I, I]$, where I is a nonzero right ideal of R.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 16N60, 16U80, 16W25.

Keywords: Prime ring, generalized derivation, extended centroid, Utumi quotient ring.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, R always denotes a prime ring with center $Z(R)$ and with extended centroid C, U the Utumi quotient ring of R. For given $x, y \in R$, the Lie commutator of x, y is denoted by $[x, y]$ and defined by $[x, y] = xy - yx$. A linear mapping $d : R \to R$ is called a derivation, if it satisfies the Leibniz rule $d(xy) = d(x)y + xd(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$. We recall that an additive map $H : R \to R$ is called a generalized derivation, if there exists a derivation $d : R \to R$ such that $H(xy) = H(x)y + xd(y)$ holds for all $x, y \in R$. Let S be a nonempty subset of R and $F : R \to R$ be an additive mapping. Then we say that F acts as homomorphism or anti-homomorphism on S if $F(xy) = F(x)F(y)$ or $F(xy) = F(y)F(x)$ holds for all $x, y \in S$ respectively. The additive mapping F acts as a Jordan homomorphism on S if $F(x^2) = F(x)^2$ holds for all $x \in S$.

Several authors studied the situations, when some specific type of additive maps acts as homomorphisms or anti-homomorphisms in some subsets of R. For instance Asma, Rehman and Shakir in [1] proved that if d is a derivation of a 2-torsion free

prime ring R which acts as a homomorphism or ani-homomorphism on a square closed Lie ideal L of R, then $d = 0$ or $L \subseteq Z(R)$. Recently, in [10] Golbasi and Kaya study the case when derivation d is replaced by generalized derivation H. More precisely, they proved the following: Let R be a prime ring of characteristic different from 2, H a generalized derivation of R, L a Lie ideal of R such that $u^2 \in L$ for all $u \in L$. If H acts as a homomorphism or anti-homomorphism on L, then either $d = 0$ or $L \subseteq Z(R)$.

Recently in [7], De Filippis studied the situation when generalized derivation H acts as a Jordan homomorphism on a non-central Lie ideal L of R and on the set $[I, I]$, where I is a nonzero right ideal of a prime ring R.

In the present paper our motivation is to generalize all the above results by studying the following situations: (1) $H(u^2)^n - H(u)^{2n} \in C$ for all $u \in L$, where L is a non-central Lie ideal of R; (2) $H(u^2)^n - H(u)^{2n} = 0$ for all $u \in [I, I]$, where I is a nonzero right ideal of R.

The following results are useful tools needed in the proof of main results.

Remark 1. Let R be a prime ring and L a noncentral Lie ideal of R. If $\mathrm{char}(R) \neq 2$, by [3, Lemma 1] there exists a nonzero ideal I of R such that $0 \neq [I, R] \subseteq L$. If $\mathrm{char}(R) = 2$ and $\dim_C RC > 4$, i.e., $\mathrm{char}(R) = 2$ and R does not satisfy s_4, then by [15, Theorem 13] there exists a nonzero ideal I of R such that $0 \neq [I, R] \subseteq L$. Thus if either $\mathrm{char}(R) \neq 2$ or R does not satisfy s_4, then we may conclude that there exists a nonzero ideal I of R such that $[I, I] \subseteq L$.

Remark 2. Let R be a prime ring and U be the Utumi quotient ring of R and $C = Z(U)$, the center of U. It is well known that any derivation of R can be uniquely extended to a derivation of U, In [16] Lee proved that every generalized derivation H on a dense right ideal of R can be uniquely extended to a generalized derivation of U and assume the form $H(x) = ax + d(x)$ for all $x \in U$,some $a \in U$ and a derivation d of U.

2 Generalized derivations on Lie ideals

We establish the following results required in the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $R = M_k(F)$, be the ring of all $k \times k$ matrices over a field F with $k \geq 2$, $a \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ a fixed integer. If $(a[x, y]^2)^n - (a[x, y])^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$, then $a \in F \cdot I_k$ and either $a = 0$ or $a^n = 1$.*

Proof. Let $a = (a_{ij})_{k\times k}$ where $a_{ij} \in F$. By choosing $x = e_{ii}$, $y = e_{ij}$ for any $i \neq j$, we have

$$0 = -(ae_{ij})^{2n}. \tag{1}$$

Left multiplying (1) by e_{ij}, it gives

$$0 = e_{ij}(ae_{ij})^{2n} = a_{ji}^{2n}e_{ij},$$

implying $a_{ji} = 0$. Thus for any $i \neq j$, we have $a_{ij} = 0$, which implies that a is a diagonal matrix. Let $a = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{ii}e_{ii}$. For any F-automorphism θ of R, we have $(a^\theta[x,y]^2)^n - (a^\theta[x,y])^{2n} = 0$ for every $x, y \in R$. Hence a^θ must also be diagonal. We have

$$(1 + e_{ij})a(1 - e_{ij}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{ii}e_{ii} + (a_{jj} - a_{ii})e_{ij}$$

diagonal. Therefore, $a_{jj} = a_{ii}$ and so $a \in F \cdot I_k$. Thus the main assumption reduces to

$$a^n(a^n - 1)[x,y]^{2n} = 0$$

for all $x, y \in R$. By choosing $x = e_{ij}, y = e_{ji}$ we get $0 = a^n(a^n - 1)[e_{ij}, e_{ji}]^{2n} = a^n(a^n - 1)\{e_{ii} + e_{jj}\}$. This leads either $a = 0$ or $a^n = 1$.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $R = M_k(F)$ be the ring of all $k \times k$ matrices over a field F with $k \geq 3$, $a, b \in R$ and $n \geq 1$ a fixed integer. If $(a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2b)^n - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n} \in F \cdot I_k$, for all $x, y \in R$, then $a, b \in F \cdot I_k$ and $a - b = 0$ or $(a - b)^n = 1$.*

Proof. Let $a = (a_{ij})_{k\times k}$ and $b = (b_{ij})_{k\times k}$ where $a_{ij}, b_{ij} \in F$. By assumption we have

$$[(a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2b)^n - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n}, z] = 0,$$

for all $x, y, z \in R$. By choosing $x = e_{ii}$, $y = e_{ij}$ and $z = e_{ik}$ for any $i \neq j \neq k$, we have

$$0 = [(ae_{ij} - e_{ij}b)^{2n}, e_{ik}] = (e_{ij}b)^{2n}e_{ik} - e_{ik}(ae_{ij})^{2n} = (b_{ji})^n e_{ik} - a_{ki}(a_{ji})^{2n-1}e_{ij}.$$

Thus $b_{ji} = 0$. We conclude that b is a diagonal matrix. By the same argument in Lemma 2.1, we have $b \in F \cdot I_k$. Similarly we can conclude $a \in F \cdot I_k$. Therefore the main assumption says that

$$(a - b)^n(1 - (a - b)^n)([[x,y]^{2n}, z]) = 0.$$

Hence $a - b = 0$ or $(a - b)^n = 1$.

Lemma 2.3 *Let R be a noncommutative prime ring with extended centroid C, I a nonzero ideal of R and $a, b \in R$. Suppose that $(a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^n = (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n}$ for all $x, y \in I$, where $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. Then $a, b \in C$ and either $a - b = 0$ or $(a-b)^n = 1$.*

Proof. By assumption, I satisfies the generalized polynomial identity

$$F(x,y) = (a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^n - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n}.$$

By Chuang [4, Theorem 2], this generalized polynomial identity (GPI) is also satisfied by U. If $a \notin C$ or $b \notin C$, then $F(x,y) = 0$ is a nontrivial (GPI) for U. In case C is infinite, we have $F(x,y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in U \bigotimes_C \overline{C}$ where $\overline{C}$ is the algebraic closure of C. Since both U and $U \bigotimes_C \overline{C}$ are prime and centrally closed [8], we may replace R by U or $U \bigotimes_C \overline{C}$ according to C is finite or infinite. Thus we may assume that R is centrally closed over C which is either finite or algebraically closed and $F(x,y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$. By Martindale's Theorem [17], R is then a primitive ring having nonzero $soc(R)$ with C as the associated division ring. Hence by Jacobson's Theorem [12], R is isomorphic to a dense ring of linear transformations of a vector space V over C. If $\dim_C V = k$, then the density of R on V implies that $R \cong M_k(C)$. Since R is noncommutative, $k \geq 2$.

We want to show that for any $v \in V$, v and bv are linearly C-dependent. Suppose on contrary that v and bv are linearly C-independent for some $v \in V$. By density there exist $x, y \in R$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} xv = 0, \quad xbv = -bv, \\ yv = v, \quad\quad ybv = v. \end{aligned}$$

Then $[x,y]v = 0$, $[x,y]bv = v$, and so $[x,y]^2 bv = 0$. Hence

$$0 = ((a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^n - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n})v = -v,$$

a contradiction. Thus we conclude that $\{v, bv\}$ is a linearly C-dependent set of vectors for any $v \in V$. Thus for any $v \in V$, $bv = \alpha_v v$ for some $\alpha_v \in C$. Now we prove that α_v is independent of the choice of $v \in V$. Let u be a fixed vector of V. Then $bu = \alpha u$. Let v be any vector of V. Then $bv = \alpha_v v$, where $\alpha_v \in C$. If u and v are linearly C-dependent, then $u = \beta v$, for $\beta \in C$. In this case, we see that $\alpha u = bu = \beta bv = \beta(\alpha_v v) = \alpha_v(\beta v) = \alpha_v u$, implying $\alpha = \alpha_v$.

Now if u and v are linearly C-independent, then we have $\alpha_{u+v}(u+v) = b(u+v) = bu + bv = \alpha u + \alpha_v v$, which implies $(\alpha_{u+v} - \alpha)u + (\alpha_{u+v} - \alpha_v)v = 0$. Since u and v are linearly C-independent, we have $\alpha_{u+v} - \alpha = 0 = \alpha_{u+v} - \alpha_v$ and so $\alpha = \alpha_v$. Thus $bv = \alpha v$ for all $v \in V$, where $\alpha \in C$ is independent of the choice of $v \in V$.

Now, let $r \in R$ and $v \in V$. Since $bv = \alpha v$,

$$[b, r]v = (br)v - (rb)v = b(rv) - r(bv) = (rv)\alpha - r(v\alpha) = 0,$$

that is $[b, r]V = 0$. Hence $[b, r] = 0$ for all $r \in R$, implying $b \in C$.

Then our assumption reduces to $(a'[x, y]^2)^n - (a'[x, y])^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$, where $a' = a - b$. If $\dim_C V = k$, then by Lemma 2.1, we have $a' = a - b \in C$ and either $a' = 0$ or $a'^n = 1$. Since $b \in C$, $a \in C$. Let $\dim_C V = \infty$. Then for any $e^2 = e \in soc(R)$ we have $eRe \cong M_t(C)$ with $t = \dim_C Ve$. Assume that $a' \notin C$. Then a does not centralize the nonzero ideal $soc(R)$. Hence there exist $h \in soc(R)$ such that $[a, h] \neq 0$. By Litoff's theorem [9], there exists idempotent $e \in soc(R)$ such that $a'h, ha', h \in eRe$. We have $eRe \cong M_k(C)$ with $k = \dim_C Ve$. Since R satisfies generalized identity $e\{(a'[exe, eye]^2)^n - (a'[exe, eye])^{2n}\}e = 0$, the subring eRe satisfies $(ea'e[x, y]^2)^n - (ea'e[x, y])^{2n} = 0$. Then by the above finite dimensional case, $ea'e$ is a central element of eRe. Thus $ah = (eae)h = heae = ha$, a contradiction. Hence we conclude that $a' \in C$. Then our identity reduces to $a'^n(a'^n - 1)[x, y]^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$. Since $\dim_C V = \infty$, R can not satisfy any polynomial identity, and hence $a'^n(a'^n - 1) = 0$ implying either $a' = 0$ or $a'^n = 1$. Since $a' = a - b$, we obtain our conclusion.

Theorem 2.4 *Let R be a prime ring, H a nonzero generalized derivation of R and L a non-central Lie ideal of R. Suppose that $H(u^2)^n - H(u)^{2n} = 0$ for all $u \in L$, where $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. Then one of the following holds:*

1. *$char(R) = 2$ and R satisfies s_4;*

2. *$H(x) = bx$ for some $b \in C$ and $b^n = 1$.*

Proof. We assume that either $\text{char}(R) \neq 2$ or R does not satisfy s_4. Since L is non central by Remark 1, there exists a nonzero ideal I of R such that $[I, I] \subseteq L$. Thus by assumption, I satisfies the differential identity

$$H([x, y]^2)^n - H([x, y])^{2n} = 0.$$

Since I and U satisfy the same differential identities [16], we may assume that $H([x,y]^2)^n - H([x,y])^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in U$. As we have remarked in Remark 2, we may assume that for all $x \in U$, $H(x) = bx + d(x)$ for some $b \in U$ and a derivation d of U. Hence U satisfies

$$(b[x,y]^2 + d([x,y]^2])^n - (b[x,y] + d([x,y]])^{2n} = 0. \tag{2}$$

Assume first that d is inner derivation of U, i.e., there exists $p \in U$ such that $d(x) = [p,x]$ for all $x \in U$. Then

$$(b[x,y]^2 + [p,[x,y]^2])^n - (b[x,y] + [p,[x,y]])^{2n} = 0,$$

for all $x, y \in U$ that is

$$((b+p)[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 p)^n - ((b+p)[x,y] - [x,y]p)^{2n} = 0,$$

for all $x, y \in U$. By Lemma 2.3, $b + p, p \in C$ and $b = 0$ or $b^n = 1$. If $b = 0$ then $H(x) = 0$, a contradiction. Otherwise, $H(x) = bx$ for some $b \in C$ and $b^n = 1$, as desired.

On the other hand (2) implies

$$\begin{aligned}&(b[x,y]^2 + ([d(x),y] + [x,d(y)])[x,y] + [x,y]([d(x),y] + [x,d(y)]))^n \\ &-(b[x,y] + [d(x),y] + [x,d(y)])^{2n} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in U$. So if d is not U-inner, then by Kharchenko's theorem [13], we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(b[x,y]^2 + ([z,y] + [x,t])[x,y] + [x,y]([z,y] + [x,t]))^n \\ &-(a[x,y] + [z,y] + [x,t])^{2n} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y, z, t \in U$. In particular, for $x = t = 0$, we have $[z,y]^{2n} = 0$ for all $z, y \in U$. Note that this is a polynomial identity and hence there exists a field F such that $R \subseteq M_k(F)$, the ring of $k \times k$ matrices over a field F, where $k \geq 1$. Moreover, R and $M_k(F)$ satisfy the same polynomial identity [14, Lemma 1] that is $[z,y]^{2n} = 0$ for all $y, z \in M_k(F)$. But by choosing $z = e_{12}$, $y = e_{21}$ we get

$$0 = [z,y]^{2n} = e_{11} + e_{22}$$

which is a contradiction.

Lemma 2.5 *Let R be a noncommutative prime ring with extended centroid C and $a, b \in R$. Suppose that $(a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^n - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n} \in C$ for all $x, y \in R$, where $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. Then one of the following holds:*

1. *$a, b \in C$, such that $a - b = 0$ or $(a-b)^n = 1$;*

2. *R satisfies s_4.*

Proof. Since R and U satisfy the same generalized polynomial identities (see [4]), U satisfies

$$g(x,y,z) = [(a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^n - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n}, z]. \tag{3}$$

Suppose first that $g(x,y,z)$ is a trivial generalized polynomial identity for R. Let $T = U *_C C\{x,y,z\}$ be the free product of U and $C\{x,y,z\}$, the free C-algebra in noncommuting indeterminates x, y, z. Then

$$[(a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^n - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n}, z]$$

is zero element in T. Let $a \notin C$. Then a and 1 are linearly independent over C. Thus from above,

$$\{a[x,y]^2(a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^{n-1} - a[x,y](a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n-1}\}z$$

is zero element in T that is

$$a[x,y]\Big\{[x,y](a[x,y]^2 - [x,y]^2 b)^{n-1} - (a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n-1}\Big\}z = 0$$

in T. Again since a and 1 are linearly independent, we have

$$a[x,y]\Big\{ - a[x,y](a[x,y] - [x,y]b)^{2n-2}\Big\}z = 0$$

and so $a[x,y]\{-a[x,y](a[x,y])^{2n-2}\}z = 0$ in T implying $a = 0$, a contradiction. Hence $a \in C$. Then the identity reduces to

$$[([x,y]^2(a-b))^n - ([x,y](a-b))^{2n}, z] = 0.$$

Again if $a - b \notin C$, then it gives

$$z\Big\{([x,y]^2(a-b))^{n-1}[x,y]^2(a-b) - ([x,y](a-b))^{2n-1}[x,y](a-b)\Big\} = 0$$

that is

$$z\Big\{([x,y]^2(a-b))^{n-1}[x,y] - ([x,y](a-b))^{2n-1}\Big\}[x,y](a-b) = 0$$

in T. This again implies $z\{-([x,y](a-b))^{2n-1}\}[x,y](a-b) = 0$, implying $a - b = 0$, a contradiction. Hence $a - b \in C$. Since $a \in C$, we have $b \in C$. Then the (GPI)

becomes $(a-b)^n((a-b)^n-1)[x,y]^{2n} \in C$. This gives either $a-b=0$ or $(a-b)^n=1$, which is our conclusion.

Next we assume that $g(x,y,z)$ is a nontrivial generalized polynomial identity for R and so for U. Let I be a two-sided ideal of U. If $(a[x,y]^2-[x,y]^2b)^n-(a[x,y]-[x,y]b)^{2n}=0$ for all $x,y \in I$, then the conclusion follows by Lemma 2.3. Hence we assume that there exist $x,y \in I$, such that $0 \neq (a[x,y]^2-[x,y]^2b)^n-(a[x,y]-[x,y]b)^{2n} \in I \cap C$. Then by [6, Theorem 1], R is a PI-ring, therefore $RC=Q=U$ is a is a finite-dimensional central simple C-algebra by Posner's theorem for prime PI-ring. Then by Lemma 2 in [14], there exists a field F such that $U \subseteq M_k(F)$, the ring of all $k \times k$ matrices over F, moreover U and $M_k(F)$ satisfy the same generalized identities. Therefore $M_k(F)$ satisfies $g(x,y,z)$ and then the result follows from Lemma 2.2.
Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 2.6 *Let R be a prime ring with extended centroid C, H a nonzero generalized derivation of R and L a non-central Lie ideal of R. Suppose that $H(u^2)^n-H(u)^{2n} \in C$ for all $u \in L$, where $n \geq 1$ is a fixed integer. Then R satisfies s_4 or $H(x)=bx$ for some $b \in C$ and $b^n=1$.*

Proof. Let R does not satisfy s_4. Then by Remark 1, there exists an ideal $0 \neq I$ of R such that $0 \neq [I,I] \subseteq L$. Then by assumption, $H([x,y]^2)^n-H([x,y])^{2n} \in C$ for all $x,y \in I$. If H is inner generalized derivation of R, then the result follows by Lemma 2.5. Let H be not inner. Then by Remark 2, H has the form $H(x)=bx+d(x)$, where $b \in U$ and d is a derivation of U. Since I and U satisfy the same generalized polynomial identities (see [4]) as well as the same differential identities (see [16]), we may assume that U satisfies $[(b[x,y]^2+d([x,y]^2])^n-(b[x,y]+d([x,y]])^{2n},w]=0$. Since H is not inner, d is also not inner derivation of U. We have

$$[(b[x,y]^2+([d(x),y]+[x,d(y)])[x,y]+[x,y]([d(x),y]+[x,d(y)]))^n$$
$$-(b[x,y]+[d(x),y]+[x,d(y)])^{2n},w]=0.$$

By Kharchenko's theorem [13] and then by same argument of Theorem 2.4, we have $[[z,y]^{2n},w]=0$ for all $z,y,w \in U$. This is a polynomial identity for U. Then by [14, Lemma 2], there exists a field F such that $U \subseteq M_k(F)$, the ring of all $k \times k$ matrices over F, moreover U and $M_k(F)$ satisfy the same generalized identities. If $k \leq 2$, then U and so R satisfies s_4, as desired. If $k \geq 3$, then $0=[[z,y]^{2n},w]=[[e_{12},e_{21}]^{2n},e_{13}]=e_{13}$, a contradiction.

3 Generalized derivations on right ideals

In this section we will prove the following theorem:

Theorem 3.1 *Let R be a prime ring, I a non-zero right ideal of R and H a non-zero generalized derivation of R. If $H(u^2)^n - H(u)^{2n} = 0$ for all $u \in [I, I]$ then one of the following holds:*

1. *$[I, I]I = 0$;*
2. *there exists $a \in U$ such that $H(x) = xa$ for all $x \in I$ with $aI = 0$;*
3. *there exists $a \in U$ such that $H(x) = ax$ for all $x \in R$ with $aI = 0$;*
4. *there exists $a, b \in U$ such that $H(x) = ax + xb$ for all $x \in R$ with $(a - \alpha)I = (b - \beta)I = 0$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in C$ and $(\alpha + \beta)^n = 1$.*

To prove this theorem, we need the following:

Lemma 3.2 *Let R be a prime ring with extended centroid C and I a nonzero right ideal of R. If for some $a, b \in R$, $(a[x_1, x_2]^2 + [x_1, x_2]^2 b)^n - (a[x_1, x_2] + [x_1, x_2]b)^{2n} = 0$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in I$, then R satisfy a non-trivial generalized polynomial identity or there exist $\alpha, \beta \in C$ such that $(a - \alpha)I = 0$, $(b - \beta)I = 0$ with $\alpha + \beta = 0$ or $(\alpha + \beta)^n = 1$ or $b = -\alpha \in C$.*

Proof. By our hypothesis, for any $x_0 \in I$, R satisfies the following generalized identity

$$(a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2 + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2 b)^n - (a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2] + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]b)^{2n}. \tag{4}$$

We assume that this is a trivial (GPI) for R, for otherwise we are done. If there exists $x_0 \in I$ such that $\{x_0, ax_0\}$ is linearly C-independent, then from above we have that R satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2(a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2 + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2 b)^{n-1} \\ &-a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2](a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2] + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]b)^{2n-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned} a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]\Big\{&[x_0x_1, x_0x_2](a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2 + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2 b)^{n-1} \\ &-(a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2] + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]b)^{2n-1}\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Again since $\{x_0, ax_0\}$ is linearly C-independent we have

$$a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]\Big\{ - a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2](a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2] + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]b)^{2n-2}\Big\} = 0$$

and then by the same manner we have

$$a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]\Big\{ - a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2](a[x_0x_1, x_0x_2])^{2n-2}\Big\} = 0,$$

which is nontrivial, a contradiction. Thus $\{x, ax\}$ is linearly C-dependent for all $x \in I$ that is $(a-\alpha)I = 0$ for some $\alpha \in C$. Then our generalized identity reduces to

$$(\alpha[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2 + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2b)^n - (\alpha[x_0x_1, x_0x_2] + [x_0x_1, x_0x_2]b)^{2n} = 0$$

that is

$$([x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^2(b+\alpha))^n - ([x_0x_1, x_0x_2](b+\alpha))^{2n} = 0. \tag{7}$$

This is

$$[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]\Big\{[x_0x_1, x_0x_2](b+\alpha)([x_0x_1, x_0x_2](b+\alpha))^{n-1} - ((b+\alpha)[x_0x_1, x_0x_2])^{2n-1}(b+\alpha)\Big\} = 0.$$

If $\{x_0, (b+\alpha)x_0\}$ is linearly independent over C, then

$$[x_0x_1, x_0x_2]\Big\{ - ((b+\alpha)[x_0x_1, x_0x_2])^{2n-1}(b+\alpha)\Big\} = 0,$$

which is nontrivial, a contradiction. Thus $\{x, (b+\alpha)x\}$ is linearly dependent over C for all $x \in I$, that is $(b+\alpha-\gamma)I = 0$ for some $\gamma \in C$. Let $\beta = \gamma - \alpha$. Then $(b-\beta)I = 0$. Thus our generalized identity (7) reduces to

$$([x_0x_1, x_0x_2]^{2n})(\alpha+\beta)^{n-1}\{1 - (\alpha+\beta)^n\}(b+\alpha) = 0. \tag{8}$$

Since this is a trivial (GPI) for R, we conclude that either $\alpha+\beta = 0$ or $(\alpha+\beta)^n = 1$ or $b = -\alpha \in C$.

Lemma 3.3 *Let R be a prime ring with extended centroid C and I be a right ideal of R. Let H be an inner generalized derivation of R. If $H([x,y]^2)^n - H([x,y])^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$, then one of the following holds:*

1. *$[I, I]I = 0$;*

2. *there exists $a \in U$ such that $H(x) = xa$ for all $x \in I$ with $aI = 0$;*

3. *there exists* $a \in U$ *such that* $H(x) = ax$ *for all* $x \in R$ *with* $aI = 0$*;*

4. *there exists* $a, b \in U$ *such that* $H(x) = ax + xb$ *for all* $x \in R$ *with* $(a - \alpha)I = (b - \beta)I = 0$ *for some* $\alpha, \beta \in C$ *and* $(\alpha + \beta)^n = 1$*.*

Proof. Since H is inner, there exist $a, b \in U$ such that $H(x) = ax + xb$ for all $x \in R$. If R does not satisfy any non-trivial (GPI), then by Lemma 3.2, we conclude that there exist $\alpha, \beta \in C$ such that $(a - \alpha)I = 0$, $(b - \beta)I = 0$ with $\alpha + \beta = 0$ or $(\alpha + \beta)^n = 1$ or $b = -\alpha \in C$. If $\alpha + \beta = 0$, then for all $x \in I$, $H(x) = ax + xb = \alpha x + xb = x(\alpha + b)$ with $0 = (\alpha + \beta)I = (\alpha + b)I$, which is our conclusion (2). If $b = -\alpha \in C$, then for all $x \in R$, $H(x) = ax + xb = (a - \alpha)x$ with $(a - \alpha)I = 0$, which is our conclusion (3). In other case we get our conclusion (4).

So we assume that R satisfies a non-trivial (GPI).

If $I = R$, then by Lemma 2.3, $a, b \in C$ with $a + b = 0$ or $(a + b)^n = 1$. Hence $H(x) = \lambda x$ for all $x \in R$, with $\lambda^n = 1$, since H is nonzero generalized derivation of R, where $\lambda = a + b$. Thus conclusion (4) is obtained.

Now let $I \neq R$. In this case we want to prove that either $[I, I]I = 0$ or there exist $\alpha, \beta \in C$ such that $(a - \alpha)I = 0$ and $(b - \beta)I = 0$. To prove this, by contradiction, we suppose that there exist $c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_5 \in I$ such that

- $[c_1, c_2]c_3 \neq 0$;
- $(a - \alpha)c_4 \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in C$ or $(b - \beta)c_5 \neq 0$ for all $\beta \in C$.

Now we show that this assumption leads a number of contradictions. Since R satisfies nontrivial (GPI), by [17], RC is a primitive ring having a nonzero socle H' with a nonzero right ideal $J = IH'$. Notice that H' is simple, $J = JH'$ and J satisfies the same basic conditions as I. Thus we replace R by H' and I by J.

Then since R is a regular ring, for $c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_5 \in I$ there exists $e^2 = e \in R$ such that

$$eR = c_1R + c_2R + c_3R + c_4R + c_5R.$$

Then $e \in I$ and $ec_i = c_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, 5$. Let $x \in R$. Then by our hypothesis we have

$$(a[e, ex(1 - e)]^2 + [e, ex(1 - e)]^2b)^n - (a[e, ex(1 - e)] + [e, ex(1 - e)]b)^{2n} = 0. \quad (9)$$

Left multiplying by $(1-e)$ we have $((1-e)aex)^{2n}(1-e) = 0$, that is $((1-e)aex)^{2n+1} = 0$ for all $x \in R$. By Levitzkis lemma [11, Lemma 1.1], we have $(1 - e)aeR = 0$

implying $(1-e)ae = 0$. Analogously, right multiplying by e, we get $(1-e)be = 0$. Therefore $ae = eae$ and $be = ebe$. Moreover, since R satisfies

$$e\{(a[ex_1e, ex_2e]^2 + [ex_1e, ex_2e]^2b)^n - (a[ex_1e, ex_2e] + [ex_1e, ex_2e]b)^{2n}\}e = 0,$$

eRe satisfies

$$(eae[x_1, x_2]^2 + [x_1, x_2]^2ebe)^n - (eae[x_1, x_2] + [x_1, x_2]ebe)^{2n} = 0.$$

Then by Lemma 2.3, one of the following holds: (1) $[eRe, eRe] = 0$, (2) $eae, ebe \in Ce$. Now $[eRe, eRe] = 0$ implies $[eR, eR]eR = 0$ which contradicts with the choices of c_1, c_2, c_3. Thus $eae = ae \in Ce$ and $ebe = be \in Ce$. Therefore, there exist $\alpha, \beta \in C$ such that $(a-\alpha)e = 0$ and $(b-\beta)e = 0$. This gives $(a-\alpha)eR = 0$ and $(b-\beta)eR = 0$. In any case this contradicts with the choices of c_4 and c_5.

In case $[I, I]I = 0$, conclusion (1) is obtained. Let $(a-\alpha)I = 0$ and $(b-\beta)I = 0$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in C$. Then our hypothesis $(a[x, y]^2 + [x, y]^2b)^n - (a[x, y] + [x, y]b)^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$ gives $(\alpha[x, y]^2 + [x, y]^2b)^n - (\alpha[x, y] + [x, y]b)^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$. Right multiplying above relation by $[x, y]$, we have $(\alpha+\beta)^n\{1-(\alpha+\beta)^n\}[x, y]^{2n+1} = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$. This implies either $\alpha + \beta = 0$ or $(\alpha + \beta)^n = 1$ or $[x, y]^{2n+1} = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$. The last relation implies $[I, I]I = 0$ (see [5, Lemma 2 (II)]), which is our conclusion (1). In case $\alpha + \beta = 0$, as before, conclusion (2) is obtained. In other case conclusion (4) is obtained.

Now we are in a position to prove our main theorem for right ideals.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. If H is inner generalized derivation of R, then by Lemma 3.3, we are done. Now let H be not inner. By Remark 2, we have $H(x) = ax + d(x)$ for some $a \in U$ and a derivation d on U. Let $x, y \in I$. Then by [4], U satisfies

$$(a[xX, yY]^2 + d([xX, yY]^2))^n - (a[xX, yY] + d([xX, yY]))^{2n} = 0$$

that is

$$(a[xX, yY]^2 + d([xX, yY])[xX, yY] + [xX, yY]d([xX, yY]))^n - (a[xX, yY] + d([xX, yY]))^{2n} = 0.$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}(a[xX, yY]^2 &+ ([d(x)X + xd(X), yY] + [xX, d(y)Y + yd(Y)])[xX, yY] \\ &+ [xX, yY]([d(x)X + xd(X), yY] + [xX, d(y)Y + yd(Y)]))^n \\ &- (a[xX, yY] + [d(x)X + xd(X), yY] + [xX, d(y)Y + yd(Y)])^{2n} = 0. \qquad (10)\end{aligned}$$

Since H is not inner, d is also not inner derivation. Then by Kharchenko's Theorem [13], U satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}(a[xX, yY]^2 + ([d(x)X + xZ_1, yY] + [xX, d(y)Y + yZ_2])[xX, yY] \\ +[xX, yY]([d(x)X + xZ_1, yY] + [xX, d(y)Y + yZ_2]))^n \\ -(a[xX, yY] + [d(x)X + xZ_1, yY] + [xX, d(y)Y + yZ_2])^{2n} = 0. \qquad (11)\end{aligned}$$

In particular for $X = 0$, we have $[xZ_1, yY]^{2n} = 0$ for all $Z_1, Y \in U$. In particular, $[x, y]^{2n} = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$. Then by [5, Lemma 2 (II)], $[I, I]I = 0$, which is our conclusion (1).

From above Theorem 3.1 following corollaries are straightforward.

Corollary 3.4 *Let R be a prime ring, I a non-zero right ideal of R and H a non-zero generalized derivation of R. If H acts as a Jordan homomorphism on the set $[I, I]$, then one of the following holds:*

1. *$[I, I]I = 0$;*
2. *there exists $a \in U$ such that $H(x) = xa$ for all $x \in I$ with $aI = 0$;*
3. *there exists $a \in U$ such that $H(x) = ax$ for all $x \in R$ with $aI = 0$;*
4. *there exists $q \in U$ such that $H(x) = xq$ for all $x \in I$ with $qx = x$ for all $x \in I$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, conclusions (1)-(3) are obtained. Thus we have only to consider the case, when $H(x) = ax + xb$ for all $x \in R$ with $(a - \alpha)I = (b - \beta)I = 0$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in C$ and $\alpha + \beta = 1$. In this case, for all $x \in I$, we have $H(x) = ax + xb = \alpha x + xb = x(\alpha + b)$, where $0 = (b - \beta)I = (b + \alpha - 1)I$. This is our conclusion (4).

References

[1] A. Asma, N. Rehman, A. Shakir, On Lie ideals with derivations as homomorphisms and anti-homomorphisms, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 101 (1-2) (2003), 79-82.

[2] K. I. Beidar, W. S. Martindale III, A. V. Mikhalev, *Rings with generalized identities.* Pure and Applied Math. Vol. 196 (1996), New York, Marcel Dekker.

[3] J. Bergen, I. N. Herstein, J. W. Kerr, Lie ideals and derivations of prime rings, *J. Algebra.* 71 (1981), 259-267.

[4] C. L. Chuang, GPI's having coefficients in Utumi quotient rings *proc. Amer. Math. soc.* 103 (1988), 723-728.

[5] C. M. Chang, Power central values of derivations on multilinear polynomials, *Taiwanese J. Math.*, 7 (2) (2003), 329-338.

[6] C. M. Chang and T. K. Lee, Annihilators of power values of derivations in prime rings, *Comm. Algebra.* , 26 (7) (1998), 2091-2113.

[7] V. De Filippis, Generalized derivations as Jordan homomorphisms on Lie ideals and right ideals, *Acta Math. Sinica, English Series* 25 (2) (2009), 1965-1974.

[8] T. S. Erickson, W. S. Martindale III, J. M. Osborn, Prime nonassociative algebras, *Pacific J. Math.* 60 (1975), 49-63.

[9] C. Faith, Y. Utumi, On a new proof of Litoff's theorem, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.* 14 (1963), 369-371.

[10] O. Golbasi, K. Kaya, On Lie ideals with generalized derivations, *Sibrian Math.*, 47 (5) (2006), 862-866.

[11] I. N. Herstein, *Topics in ring theory*. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, (1969).

[12] N. Jacobson, *Structure of rings*. Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Pub. 37. Providence, RI: Amer. Math. Soc. (1964).

[13] V. K. Kharchenko, Differential identity of prime rings, *Algebra and Logic* 17 (1978), 155-168.

[14] C. Lanski, An engle condition with derivation, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 183 (3) (1993), 731-734.

[15] C. Lanski, S. Montgomery, Lie structure of prime rings of characteristic 2, *Pacific J. Math.* 42 (1) (1972), 117-136.

[16] T. K. Lee, Semiprime rings with differential identities, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica*, 20 (1) (1992), 27-38.

[17] W. S. Martindale III, Prime rings satistying a generalized polynomial identity, *J. Algebra.* 12 (1972), 576-584.

Basudeb Dhara
Department of Mathematics
Belda College, Belda
Paschim Medinipur-721424, INDIA
e-mail: basu_dhara@yahoo.com

Shervin Sahebi, Venus Rahmani
Department of Mathematics
Islamic Azad University
Central Tehran Branch, 13185/768, Tehran, IRAN
e-mail: sahebi@iauctb.ac.ir
e-mail: ven.rahmani.math@iauctb.ac.ir